

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 1 is amended. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

The courtesies extended to Applicants' representative by Examiner Johnson of the interview held May 19, 2005, are appreciated. The reasons presented in the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicants' record of the interview.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Popp (U.S. Patent No. 5,433,950); and claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Fox et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,215,769). The rejections are respectfully traversed.

Specifically, none of the applied references disclose or suggest an evaporative crystallisation process wherein the effective amount of crystal growth inhibitor is less than 50,000 mg per kg of mother liquor, to form an octahedral or spherical high-purity salt wherein the K and/or Br and/or SO₄ and/or Ca content is at least 5% lower than in salt crystallized from the same mother liquor but without using a crystal growth inhibitor, as recited in independent claim 1.

Popp teaches a film forming flexible collodion composition that can be improved by including one or more polymers in an amount sufficient to increase the resilience of the film formed (Abstract).

Fox teaches sauces and salad dressings containing a soluble calcium source comprising specific molar ratios of calcium, citrate and malate or calcium acitate (Abstract).

Accordingly, neither Popp nor Fox, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest an evaporative crystallization process with an effective amount of crystal growth inhibitor that is lower than 50,000 mg per kg of mother liquor. Moreover, neither Popp nor Fox, alone or in combination disclose or suggest an octahedral or spherical salt wherein the K and/or Br and/or

SO₄ and/or Ca content is at least 5% lower than in salt crystallized from the same mother liquor but without using a crystal growth inhibitor.

As such, neither Popp nor Fox, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the features of independent claim 1. As such, independent claim 1, and its dependent claims, are patentable over the applied references. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-12 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



William P. Berridge
Registration No. 30,024

Tarik M. Nabi
Registration No. 55,478

WPB:TMN/tje

Date: June 22, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--